Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ABSTRACT

OF

COMMUNICATIONS ON ETHNOLOGY,

MADE TO SECTION E. OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

Read 10th November, 1852.

THE twenty-second meeting of the Association was held at Belfast, beginning on the 1st September 1852, and ending on the 7th September. All the sections met in Queen's College. Section E, devoted to Ethnology and Geography, met under the presidency of Col. Chesney, R.A. D.C.L. F.R.S., and the following office-bearers:

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

Sir R. H. Murchison, G.C.St.S. F.R.S.
Rev. Edward Hincks, D.D.

COMMITTEE.

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, F.E.S.
Captain Allen, R.N. F.R.S.
Rev. William Bruce, M.A.
Rev. A. Hume, LL.D.
F. Hindmarsh, F.G.S. F.E.S.
Sir Henry Marsh, Bart., M.D. F.R.S.
John Grattan, Esq.
Professor MacDouall, M.A.
Joseph Moore, M.D. F.E.S.
Rear-Admiral Sir John Ross.
Colonel Sykes, F.R.S.
Lieut. Macleod, R.N.
J. G. Price, Esq.
J. Beete Jukes, F.G.S.
Wentworth Dilke, Esq.
J. J. Murphy, Esq.
Col. Sabine, R.A. F.R.S.
Dr. M'Gee, R.N.
Dr. Stranger, R.N.

SECRETARIES.

Richard Cull. | Robert MacAdam. | Norton Shaw, M.D.

THURSDAY, *September 2*, 1852.

On the Ethnological Bearing of the Recent Discoveries in connexion with the Assyrian Inscriptions. By the Rev. EDWARD HINCKS, M.D.

Correct ethnological reasoning must be founded on facts, of the present or former existence of which we have satisfactory evidence; that is, statements in relation to them, reduced to writing while they existed, and that by persons who must have been cognizant of the reality of what they recorded. Facts of this nature may be isolated, or reduced to a system by those who recorded them. Of such a system we have a good example in the Germania of Tacitus, Dr. Latham's recent edition of which was warmly commended. Other collections of facts of a somewhat similar character were alluded to; but all had the disadvantage of recording much as to which the collectors had only imperfect information, indiscriminately mixed up with what they knew; and again, all such collections have come down to us through many copyists, in passing through whose hands they have been much depraved.

In these respects, they must yield to the collection of facts deducible from Egyptian or Assyrio-Babylonian records, of which we possess autographs, or at any rate copies made under the superintendence of the authors, while the facts were yet recent. Nor is danger to be apprehended from intentional misrepresenting. Facts connected with history would doubtless be presented in a manner more favourable to the royal authors of the inscriptions than truth would warrant. But in facts which most concern the ethnologist, there is in general no room for misrepresentation; they being facts which come out as it were accidentally, and as to which national vanity has no place.

The facts recorded in the Assyrian inscriptions are of more importance than those in the Egyptian, because they are not clouded as the latter are by ignorance in respect to their chronology or geography. The chronology of the period to which the most important Egyptian inscriptions and papyri belong is still a subject of controversy; while it was stated that the commencements of the reigns of Sargon and Sennacherib were

as certain as those of any of the Lagidæ or of the Cæsars, Dr. Hincks had announced in a paper recently read before the Royal Irish Academy, that the twelve first years of Sargon corresponded with the twelve years assigned in the Canon of Ptolemy to Mardokempad, which name is a corruption of that of Marduk Baladan. In the course of July he had identified the three years of the Belibus of the Canon (Belib) with the second, third, and fourth of Sennacherib. It followed from this that the reign of Sargon lasted eighteen years, and that the first interregnum of the Canon, which occupied two years, is to be referred to the last year of Sargon, and the first of Sennacherib. Sargon's reign began in 721 B.C.; Sennacherib's in 703 B.C. Marduk Baladan was three times conquered; first by Sargon, in 710; secondly, by Sennacherib, in 703; and thirdly, by the same king, in 700. On the first occasion, Sargon added Mesopotamia to his kingdom; on the second, Sennacherib gave it to Belibus; and on the third, he made his son Assurnadin king of Mesopotamia and Chaldea, which last country had been left to Marduk Baladan on the two former occasions. Dr. Hincks identified this name with the Aparanadius, which is the name of the successor of Belibus in the best MS. of the Canon of Ptolemy, which is, however, not an ancient one; the Greek *p* being a mistake for *ss*, which might easily have been occasioned by the similarity of these letters.

Before Sargon we have Shalmaneser, Tiglath Pileser, and Pul. Col. Rawlinson, who had first recognised the name of Marduk Baladan, has recently discovered a series of annals of Tiglath Pileser. In a fragment of the annals of Pul, Dr. Hincks discovered the name of Menahem as a tributary, in the eighth year of his reign. This being fixed by 2 Kings vi. to about 770, his reign must have commenced about 777. Divanubar, the obelisk king, must have begun to reign about 900 B.C., as Hazael, the commencement of whose reign is known to be about 885, was king in his eighteenth year, but not in his fourteenth. Col. Rawlinson has found a series of annals of the father of this king, in which Ithobal, king of Tyre, is mentioned. It appears from the Tyrian annals, extracted by Menander, and preserved by Josephus, that he reigned from

936 to 904, which is in perfect harmony with the date of his son's reign.

Reasons were then given why the geography of the Assyrian inscriptions was capable of being better determined than of the hieroglyphic ones; namely, that the Egyptian could only go in one direction to Asiatic countries, whereas the Assyrians made expeditions in all directions; and the direction in which an unknown country lay could generally be determined by that of other countries noticed along with it, if, indeed, it was not expressly pointed out by the king's saying that he went to it over the Euphrates or the Zab.

The great ethnological fact respecting Assyria—its language—was then treated of. Dr. Hincks considered the Assyrian language to belong to a family akin to that of the Syro-Arabian languages hitherto known, rather than to that family itself. He first pointed out what it had in common with all these languages. It had verbal roots, which were normally triliteral, but of which some letters might be mutable or evanescent, whence arise different classes of irregular verbs. These roots admitted not only the simple conjugation, but others in which radical letters are doubled, other letters added, or both these modifications made at once. From these roots verbal nouns are formed, either by a simple change of the vowels, or by the addition of letters, such as are called in Hebrew Heemantic.

It agreed with the Arabian more closely than with any other Syro-Arabian language in three respects: 1st. In forming the conjugations, consonants are inserted among the radical letters, as well as prefixed to them. This takes place regularly in Arabic, but in Hebrew only where the first radical is a sibilant. 2dly, The termination of the aorist varies as in Arabic; different verbs taking different vowels between the second and third radicals, while the first radical sometimes terminates the verb, and sometimes takes after it *a* or *u*. 3dly, The forms of the plural vary, and the cases of nouns differ in a manner which resembles, in some measure, what takes place in Arabic.

The Assyrian language differed from all the Syro-Arabian languages known hitherto in the following respects: 1st. Where they have *h*, it has *s* in a variety of instances, and

especially in the pronouns and pronominal affixes of the third person—*su, si, sunu*; *su, sa, si, sun* and *sin*, most of which resemble forms in other languages, if only *h* be substituted for *s*.

The same difference occurs in the characteristic of the causative conjugation. In these respects, but not by any means generally, the Assyrian agrees with the Egyptian, and, through it, with the modern Berber. 2dly, The Assyrian has no prefixes, such as *b* for *in*, *l* for *to*, which occur in all the Syro-Arabian languages. In place of these it has separate prepositions; and to avoid the awkwardness of joining these to the prenominal affixes, and perhaps for greater clearness, nouns are inserted, forming compound prepositions, as *ina kirbisu* "in its midst," for "in it." Compound prepositions may be used also before other nouns, as *ina kirib biti*, "in the midst of the house," for *ina biti*. Sometimes the Assyrian uses affixes as substitutes for prepositions. Instead of *ana*, "to" or "for," before a noun, *ish* may be added. Thus "for a spoil" is expressed indifferently by *ana shallati* and *shallatish*. This last form has much of the nature of an adverb, and has some resemblance to the Hebrew noun with *He* locative.* 3dly, The Syro-Arabian language made frequent use of a preterite, in which the distinctions of number and person are confined to the end of the root; but the Assyrian rejects it, or at least uses it in an exceedingly sparing manner. On this account Dr. Hincks proposed to consider the Benoni participle masculine singular *in regimen* as the root. 4thly, The varieties in the termination of the future are not connected with any particles that may precede them, but of themselves indicate different tenses. The termination in *u* is certainly a pluperfect. Thus where mention is made of "that Marduk Baladan whom I *had defeated* in my former campaign," the verb is *askunu*; but whenever "I defeated" occurs in the simple narration, *askun*, *askuna*, or in a different conjugation, *astakan* is used. This law has been fully established. The addition of *a* seems not to change the

* Since this was written, Dr. Hincks has been led to alter his views as to the final *ma*, which is not connected with the pronominal affix, but with the verb that precedes it, of which it modifies the sense; thus *addin-su-ma* is not "I gave to him," but "when I had given to him," or "having given to him."—(June 1853.)

sense; it is added to every verb when what it governs follows it, and to some verbs even where it precedes it. These are chiefly such as denote locomotion.

The resemblance of the most common Assyrian prepositions and of the pronouns to Indo-European forms is curious, and points to a common though remote origin.

The Babylonian inscriptions are in the same language as the Assyrian. This was probably the court language of Babylon; but the common people most probably used the Chaldean language, in which some parts of the books of Ezra and Daniel are written.

Description of a Samoied Family seen at Archangel, in a Letter to Dr. Hodgkin. By JOHN V. GILES.

During my late visit to Archangel I had an opportunity of observing a family of Samoieds, and beg to offer a description of them. They consisted of five individuals, the father, mother, and their children, and my interest was chiefly enlisted in them by their exceedingly diminutive stature.

In beating about the coast of Lapland for some weeks, and round the North Cape, I had accustomed myself to the low stature of the Laplanders, but the height of these poor wandering Samoieds approached dwarfishness.

The mother, who was about three inches taller than the man, was scarcely four feet high. The next most striking peculiarity I observed in them was a close resemblance in features to the Chinese, or to such of the Chinese people as I have seen about Lintin, Whampoa, and Canton, who are, I believe, a race between the Chinese and Tartars. The chief point of resemblance was the oblique set of the eyes in the head, they being also small, dark, and piercing; cheek bones high; hair long and black; complexion dark and swarthy. There appeared to be much labour expended upon their dress, which consisted of an infinite number of very small pieces of deer skins, cut into the shape of lozenges or diamonds, closely and rather neatly sewed together, the fur side of the skin turned inwards. Much pains seemed to be taken to ornament them, by plaiting and working up strips of skins into tassels.

The upper vestment resembled a strait jacket, having long sleeves closed at their extremities, which appeared to be used as a scrip; for when any thing was given to them they released the arm through an opening made under the armpit, and then drew the arm in again, depositing the article in the nether extremity of the sleeve.

The lower part of their dress terminated in and was joined to a sort of mocassin, made also as the upper portion, of an infinite deal of patchwork. I imagined they had been in the habit of exhibiting themselves to English vessels, for they had learned a few words in our language, and could ask for tobacco, biscuit, and beef. To my repeated inquiries as to where they came from, they pointed to the *north-east.*

They made me several visits during my stay, seemingly very much pleased with the gifts of tobacco and biscuits they received from me, but would never come on board the ship. Unlike the people around them, they would not drink raw spirits.

The youngest of the children I judged to be about three years of age. The man's features were regular and tolerably well-looking, but in the woman I discerned the marks of premature old age: she was wrinkled and had lost some teeth. Upon first seeing them I had taken them all for children from their size, until I came to look into the woman's face, when, seeing the marks of age, and making inquiries as well as I could, they made one understand their relationship.

As they are a people not much known, I have imagined an account of them, however short, by one who had personally met with them, might contribute to your researches in ethnology.

FRIDAY, *September* 3.

On the Ethnological Manual as a Guide in Ethnological Inquiry. By RICHARD CULL, Fellow and Hon. Sec. of the Ethnological Society.

SATURDAY, *September* 4.

Notes upon a Collection of Irish Crania. By JOHN GRATTAN.

On placing this collection of ancient Irish crania before the

Section, the author offered a few remarks as to whence they were obtained, and as to their probable antiquity. For some years Mr. Grattan had been associated with Mr. Getty in his examination of the round towers in Ulster, having for his special object to rescue from destruction any crania that might be brought to light during Mr. Getty's proceedings. Ten round towers were examined in which various osseous human remains were found, including eleven crania. In all the towers, except that at Trummery, upon removing a greater or less depth of heterogeneous materials,—evidently the slow accumulation of ages,—a flooring of lime, apparently the result of the accidental dropping of mortar during the building of the tower, was reached, from which downwards the offsets that constituted the foundations of the tower extended, the interior being filled up with soil similar in all respects except compactness to the virgin soil upon which the foundation rested, and *in this soil* and *under the lime floor, without any exception whatever,* the remains when present were found.

The skulls so obtained were with one exception in so frail and crumbling a condition that it was found impossible to remove them, except in almost hopeless fragments; but by carefully saturating them with glue and cementing them together, they were restored to the condition in which they then appeared. (Specimens were exhibited.)

The ten towers examined were Drumbo, Trummery, Clones, Armoy, Drumlane, Rams' Island, Devenish, Island Mahee, Antrim, and Torry. Five of these towers contained human osseous remains; one had been previously disturbed; and four exhibited no trace whatever of any. At Trummery, a tower of comparatively recent erection, according to Dr. Petrie, the osseous remains were found in a carefully constructed stone chamber.

Of the eleven skulls discovered within the Round Towers, *one* was found at *Drumbo*; *one* at *Trummery*; *six* at *Clones*; *two* at *Armoy*; and *one* at *Drumlane.*

The whole collection (including crania from various other sources) was thrown into four chronological groups, viz. the Prehistoric, the Remote historic, the Anglo-Irish, and the Modern periods. The eleven crania from the round towers

were referred to the second or Remote historic group, which, from Dr. Petrie's researches, must belong to a period ranging between the fifth and thirteenth centuries. The tower of Drumbo not being of later erection than the sixth century, the cranium must have an antiquity of not less than twelve or thirteen hundred years. Drumlane tower being of nearly the same period, scarcely so old, its cranium therefore might be one thousand or eleven hundred years old.

The collection exhibited unquestionable evidence of the existence in Ireland at various epochs of strikingly contrasted varieties of the human family. But amongst the varieties of form attention was fixed upon one fact strongly shewn, viz. the tenacity with which different types preserved their identity through periods of time which embraced no small portion of the history of mankind.

The crania of the second group, viz. those found in the round towers, it was suggested, might possibly represent the *magnates of their day*. The construction of an elaborate stone chamber under the tower of Trummery would scarcely have been undertaken unless the individual had been a person of some importance, probably the immediate progenitor of the erector of the tower; yet, although the interment took place within the tower, it was not to be assumed that the towers were built for such a purpose. The decapitation of a slain chieftain, either by friendly or hostile hands, was a matter of ordinary occurrence. Now with the cranium from Armoy were found the three superior cervical vertebræ, *and no more*,—precisely so much of the spinal column as would remain attached to the head when separated from the trunk. Hence the inference was not unreasonable that it was removed from some fallen chieftain to rescue it from indignity, and, the tower in which it was found being probably then in the course of erection, was there interred, just as the head of Diarmid M'Fergus was buried at Clonmacnoise and his body at Connor, as recorded in the annals of the four masters A.D. 565.

A hope was expressed that the collection was but the commencement of one calculated some day to afford useful data to science; and the author concluded by expressing his own belief, that though these interesting relics of dim and distant

ages, and their congeners of more modern times, might present to the eye of the *ordinary observer* but few and barren facts, they would be found, nevertheless, when viewed through the medium of what appeared to some minds a deeper research and more exact knowledge, to stand forth, voiceless and unsuggestive as they seemed, enduring hieroglyphs of our race, pregnant with meaning of *hidden* but *grave* import, and not, perhaps, of very difficult decipherment.

MONDAY, *September* 6.

On the Forms of the Personal Pronouns of the Two First Persons in the Indian, European, Syro-Arabic, and Egyptian Languages. By the Rev. EDWARD HINCKS, D.D.

Dr. Hincks began by saying that he now only threw out suggestions, which might be followed up by others. The question, of which he took a novel view, could not be settled by considering the pronominal forms exclusively. Many other points would have to be considered; and whether the conclusions which appeared to him to follow with a high degree of probability from these forms would be confirmed or proved to be erroneous by the examination of other forms, was what he could not now say. He only wished to set persons to think. It appeared to him that a certain theory had been taken for granted, and he wished that it should be subjected to examination.

The affinity of the personal pronouns in all the Indo-European languages was not to be disputed; nor did Dr. Hincks mean to challenge any reasonable opinion respecting the absolute antiquity of the Sanskrit. What he called in question was its antiquity relative to the European languages akin to it. The case with respect to the pronouns of the two first persons might be briefly stated. The Asiatic members of this family have a final *am* which is wanting in the European numbers. Was this *am* omitted by the Europeans, or added by the Asiatics? The former is the received opinion; the latter seems more probable to Dr. Hincks. Examples of both processes are common. The English pronoun *we* is nearly the same with that in many languages of Northern Europe. It is admitted by all philologists that this has been shortened

from a more ancient form, *wir* or *wis*. This abbreviation has been made in Swedish within the Historic period. In other languages it was made in the Pre-historic period; that is, we have no written documents of an age before it was made. Philologists are, however, agreed that the *s* or *r* at the end of this form was an addition, and that there must have been an older form without it; and the received opinion is, that this form *wi* or *vi* was an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *viyam*. Dr. Hincks considered this to be a false view, He assumed a form *anwis* or *anus* (and that *wi* and *u* pass into one another appears from a vast number of instances; as the Latin termination *vis*, where the Greek and Sanskrit have *us*; the Semitic copulative conjunction, &c. &c.), from which *wis* and *nus* (*nos*) would both arise. This *anus* was the Semitic pronoun *anu*, which was common to the Indo-European and Semitic races before their separation, in the same manner as *anaku* and *anta* or *antu*; and the Indo-Europeans added *s* under a false impression that a plural termination was necessary, the fact being that *anu* was itself plural. As it is not likely that this mistake would be made simultaneously by unconnected nations, Dr. Hincks argued that the addition of *s* must have taken place while the Indo-Europeans were *one people*; and hence the necessity of assuming an ancient form which would account for both *weis* and *nos*. It was observed that *n* was peculiarly liable to be attached to words beginning with a vowel. The Irish names of Newry and of the river Nore, the English noun *newt*, in which the *n* has etymologically no place, and the abbreviations, *nan*, *ned*, *nol*, are proofs of this.

At first it was assumed that the pronoun of the first person singular in the European languages shewed traces of the Indian *am*. The *o* in *ego* might be for *om*, as the *o* in *lego* certainly was. A trace of this *o* remained in Sclavonic, and its omission in Lithuanian and Gothic was evidently a degradation. Dr. Hincks maintained, however, that this *o* might be otherwise accounted for, the Assyrian form of the pronoun being *an-aku*. According to this view, the Indian pronouns *aham* and *viyam* are so far from being the original forms, that they are obtained from late European forms; not from the more ancient *aku* and *vis*, but from the abbreviated *ak* and *vi*.

If this philological view be correct, it tends to an ethnological view, which resembles what has been advanced by Dr. Latham. The Indo-European race proceeded westward through Asia Minor, and over the Hellespont and Bosphorus. They then dispersed through Europe, and at length an offset from the Sclavonic branch returned to Asia between the Caspian and Black Seas, overrunning some countries eastward of Assyria, and at length penetrating to India.

The Semitic and Indo-European pronouns of the second person plural are distinct, having been developed in different manners after these races separated.

The Egyptian pronouns of all these persons take that *an* at their commencement which the Semitic pronouns of the first two persons have.

Heads of a Paper "On the present state of Medo-Persic Philology. By PROFESSOR MACDOUALL, M.A., Queen's College, Belfast.

Tendencies have been lately exhibited, in works treating of Comparative Philology, to disturb, whether by contraction or by enlargement, the relations which profound research was supposed to have definitively settled between the Indo-European languages and those of other families, and also to question, on various points, the principles on which the present arrangement of the members composing the Indo-European class itself reposes. In particular, the position usually assigned to the Medo-Persic element has been assailed; and not merely has the registry of its functions and claims been thought to demand revision, but a disposition has been evinced to jostle it altogether out of its existing connection. Although it was not to have been expected that such theories as those formerly advocated by Othmar Frank on one side, and Col. Vans Kennedy on another, would be reproduced after the natural history of languages had been traced by Schlegel, Humboldt, and their coadjutors, yet that the present attitude of Medo-Persic philology is a retrograde one, might be inferred from such surmises as those which, having been propounded by an authority like Dr. Latham, drew upon him unmeasured censure in a recent number of the Edinburgh

Review. If it be not certain, after all, that the Irānian speech is cognate with the Sanskrita,—if it be still possible that the organization of any of its dialects may pass for Seriform,—then it is certainly high time that the notions generally current in reference to it should be reviewed, and, if requisite, corrected. A *resumé* of the progress already made may be useful as a preliminary to prospective steps in this direction.

The languages spoken by the subjects of the Achæmenian Kings—preserved through past ages on rocks, bricks, and slabs of stone, in the Cuneiform Inscriptions—are now partially resuscitated. One of these, generally known as "the third," is admitted by all decipherers, with the (probably) solitary exception of Grotefend, to come under the Semitic category, like those of the Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia. The "second" type has not yet been so definitely classified: the designation at first given to it, "Pahlavi," has been given up, and that of "Median" has been substituted provisionally; but, while some consider it Aramaic, others are at a loss whether to treat it as Arian or as Tūrānian,—and in either case disguised by foreign accessions,—or as a hybrid offspring, and one of uncertain parentage. Only the "first" of these monumental languages is admitted by all to be Arian, and by nearly all to represent the "Old Persic." Not only its orthography, but its lexical and grammatical constitution, has been already to a great extent elucidated; and,—what it is here of importance to observe,—it has been shewn to resemble very closely the Old Sanskrita,—that of the *Vedas*.

Distinct from the languages just noticed, and likewise from each other, are those preserved in the Sacred Books of the Pārsis—whether those of the Sipāsī heretics, or those of the othodox Zoroastrians or Mazdayaçnīs. It is true that not only the antiquity and genuineness of those books has been questioned by European criticism, but that the very languages, both of that oracle of the Sipāsīs—the *Dasātīr*, and of those Zoroastrian books which are represented as the oldest and as the prototypes of the rest, have been regarded as fictitious products,—travesties of real but recent tongues, or else as mere gibberish. Whether, however, that in which the so-called

version of the *Dasātīr* is composed represents the vernacular of Persia about the time of the Moslem conquest, or is some centuries later,—and whether that of the so-called original, the *Asmānī Zabān*, be such a fabrication as the *Balai-Bōlnā* of the Sūfīs or the Formosan of Psalmanazar; or after all be, as suggested by Von Hammer and Troyer, the relic of some old local dialect,—are points which, on the one hand, cannot be regarded as finally decided, and, on the other hand, do not furnish available *data* in the present inquiry. But it has come to be generally acknowledged, in respect to the Mazdayaçnian Books, that they in reality belong to three distiuct epochs:—the originals being fragments of the revelations attributed to the undated Seer, Zarathustra;—the proximate versions or imitations of these, with some commentaries on them, being of the Sāsānian age;—and the versions of those versions, with other pieces founded upon and referring to them, coming down as far as—and in some instances even below—the era of Yazdajird. And the history of the three languages, in which these three classes of books are composed, requires now to be traced with the utmost attainable accuracy.

I. The *First* of them has been variously designated the Language of the "*Mānathar*" (="Invocations"), or "of the *Avestā*" (="Text, Discourse," or perhaps primarily "Appointment, Decree"), or "of the *Zend*" (="Book," or perhaps "*Gnosis*, Science"), from the documents in which it has been preserved. The third of these names is the one most usually employed; though Spiegel and some other scholars have lately questioned its propriety, conceiving it to designate the more recent version, in an Aramaising idiom, which will be noticed under the next head. So long as this language could be studied only in the specimens exhibited by Anquetil Duperron, its character and rank were very imperfectly apprehended; but now that its genuine physiognomy has been portrayed by the happy ingenuity of Rask, its framework rebuilt and reanimated by the master-hand of Burnouf, and its relations elicited by the comprehensive analytics of Bopp, it has assumed its rightful stand-point as one of the primary members of the Indo-European family. As yet, however, opinions remain divided in reference to its original locality,—its growth, pro-

gress, and decline,—the age, authenticity, and mutual relations of its literary muniments. The idea of Anquetil, Kleuker, and Herder, that the Zend books were composed under Darius the son of Hystaspes and succeeding kings of the Achæmenian house, has been advocated by Adelung, Rask, Malcolm, and Klaproth: Wahl likewise concurred,—although he held that their language was merely a hieratic vehicle, gradually refined from the one in popular use by the sacerdotal caste: and the late Dr. Prichard adhered to the same chronology, without pronouncing decidedly for Wahl's theory, but evidently well inclined to it. Foucher and Tychsen, however, believed the groundwork of the liturgy to date from the reign of the Mede Cyaxares I., above 600 years B.C.; while they allowed that expositions of various parts, with additional prayers and tracts, composed under the Achæmenids, must have been incorporated with antique fragments in the existing compilation so lately as under the Sāsānian dynasty. Rhode and Heeren went still farther back, making the age of Zarathustra anterior to the Median empire; and this hypothesis has been stamped with the sanction of Burnouf, Lassen, and Pott.—For the locality of "the Zend-folk," the older inquirers had pitched upon the north-west provinces of Irān, between the Caspian and Black Seas, and supposed the vocabulary to have been that of Northern Media: philological affinities were therefore sought, by Anquetil, Kleuker, and Wahl, in the subsisting dialects of Armenia and Georgia; but—more discreetly—by Klaproth and Rask in the speech of the Caucasian Irōn or Osī, whose descent from the old Medes had been traced through the Alans of the middle ages. An antagonist theory points to the north-eastern provinces, those bounded by the Caspian and Himālayan range; and, styling the speech of the *Avestā* "Sogdo-Bactrian," makes it intermediate, as to local habitation not less than age, between the "Medo-Persic" of the Achæmenian Inscriptions and the Sanskrita of the *Vedas*. And this latter theory,—first suggested by Foucher and Tychsen, afterwards maintained by Rhode and Heeren,—is now commended by Burnouf, Lassen, Pott, Spiegel, and Westergaard; while Prichard, after a show of resistance, has virtually capitulated in its favour. The definite conclusions of Westergaard on other points have not yet been announced; but, in 1843, he

proposed to keep in view, throughout his forthcoming Grammar and Dictionary, certain ideas,—previously thrown out by Mr. Erskine of Bombay,—viz. that in the extant *rifacciamento* of the Pārsī books but a small *residuum* of the old Bactrian oracles can be detected, and that their language is in a condition of decrepitude and semi-barbarism. Col. Rawlinson, in different papers, oscillates between Erskine's notion and that of Wahl; but his latest statement, in 1846, is opposed to the belief that these books conserve any tongue which was spoken under the ancient monarchy. Finally, Spiegel's acute criticism has not only dissevered the relics of most hoar antiquity from the recent Sāsānian accessions,—has not only detached from both extremes various specimens of the literature which partially bridged over the wide gap between,—but has disparted the "Old Zend" itself into two distinct dialects, and referred to each of these such of the extant documents as exhibit their respective peculiarities. What if this distinction,—which Westergaard homologates,—was one of locality rather than of age? What if one half of the book *Yacna* was composed on the western or Median side of the Caspian Lake, and the other on its eastern or Bactrian border? If so, we may amicably close all controversy about "Media" or "Bactria," as the home of the Zend speech—which must thus have been "Medo-Bactrian," and as the cradle of the Zend people—in whose sagas the spiritual and secular powers were symbolised, respectively, by Zarathustra, the Seer born in Urumīyā, and Vishtāçpā, the monarch enthroned in Balkh.

II. Under the early Sāsānian kings the *First* Book-language had become obsolete, and the *Second*,—called by the Pārsis "the speech of *Huzvāresh*" (="Auspicious Heroism," as it used to be rendered, or rather, as it is now understood, "Acceptable Sacrifice"),—became the hieratic vehicle. In this appeared both versions of the old revelations, and also some new works designed to facilitate the restoration of Magian worship, such as the *Vīrāf Nāmah*, the *Bun-Dehesh*, the *Minō-Khirad*, the *Dīn-Kard*, &c. That any secular works were composed in it, or indeed existed at that epoch, there is no evidence. In it, however, are expressed the legends upon the fire-altar-coins struck by the early Sāsānids, and also the

vernacular portions of bilingual inscriptions upon various monuments at Naqsh-e-Rustam, Naqsh-e-Rajab, and Karmān-Shāh, belonging to the same period. This fact was discovered, as is well known, by the illustrious Silvestre de Sacy. The labours of successive numismatists and decipherers have gradually, though still but imperfectly, elicited the laws and characteristics of the language: they have been most clearly expounded in an essay of Joseph Muller, and the publications of Spiegel and Westergaard are now rendering them at once more definite and more widely known. All inquirers continue to agree that it is isolated, among the Arian kin-tongues, by a copious Aramaic infusion, neither inherited from its predecessor nor transmitted to its successor, which has imparted to it a hybrid and abnormal aspect, and which at the same time assures us that this is the "language of Zardusht" described by Abū-'l-Faraji as an admixture of Old Persic with Nabathæan or Assyrio-Chaldaic. Now, these circumstances all harmonise with—if they do not absolutely require—the hypothesis, that the Huzvāresh speech must have originated in the western provinces of the empire, where the maniform intercourse of Arian and Semitic tribes would naturally produce a mongrel phraseology. While compatible with Anquetil's view of its being indigenous in Lower Media, in the region between Māzandarān and Farsistān, they rather favour that for which the cogent arguments of Erskine, Müller, Mohl, Lassen, and Knobel have secured a general reception, viz. that it was formed in the Border-land along the Tigris, including at first Khūzistān and Irāq-Ajamī, and subsequently also the northern districts about Hamadān and Kirmānshāh. They decisively preclude the fancy of Quatremère and Pott, that this language was vernacular east of the Caspian, among the Parthians,—was successfully propagated towards the west and south by the dominant Arsacids,—and only relapsed into obscurity after several reigns of the native Sāsānians. For, in this case, it should have been distinguished by a Tūrānian, not an Aramaic, infusion; its monumental inscriptions should have been found to the east, not the west, of the Great Salt Desert; its coin-legends should have belonged to the "Phil-hellenic" Arsacids,—whose mintage, however, is purely Grecian,—not to their

Sāsānian successors, whose policy would naturally have discouraged its use. Equally inadmissible is the idea of Anquetil and his immediate followers, that this dialect so early and so extensively encroached upon the domains of others, as to have been adopted, under the Kaiānian dynasty as the speech of the court and the empire, and to have maintained that rank at least 900 years, including the most brilliant and palmy period of Persian ascendancy, and reaching down almost to the Moslem invasion. It is sufficient to remark,—without mentioning the historical and geographical difficulties which hence arise,—first, that it is not *this* language which supplies the words adduced by Greek and Latin writers as exemplifying the classical Persic of their day; and, secondly, that *its* structure does not accord with the intimations of Firdausī, Nizāmī, and other Moslem authors, that the speech of the ancient monarchy had survived the revolution, and had come down to themselves so far exempt from any material change, that they had no difficulty in consulting the chronicles preserved in it.

III. In respect to the *Third* Book-language, the prevalent —and, as would appear, well-founded—belief now is, that *it* was the one referred to by Firdausī and Nizāmī; that it had been the vernacular idiom of Farsistān, which, under the later kings of the Sāsānian line, became fashionable and literary; that it ranked as the *Darī* or "Court-speech" during two centuries, but shrank into the obscurity of a book-language after A.D. 641, when it ceded its title of *Darī* by resisting that influx of Arabic terms and phrases which began thenceforward to colour the vehicle of ordinary conversation and business. Its analytical character, intermediate between the still complex —though doubtless partially relaxed—tissue of Huzvāresh and the consummated disintegration of Neo-Persic, warrants the philological soundness of this belief. Its name, "*Pārsī*," at once recals its original locality, and identifies it as the distant descendant of the language which occupies the first place in the Achæmenian Inscriptions — although, of course, the resemblance between these two has been seriously impaired by diversified influences in the wide chasm of time by which they are separated. Since in it various holy Oracles were

translated from Huzvāresh,—if not, in rare cases, even from the older hieratic tongue,—and since expositions and devotional pieces by revered Mōbeds were preserved in it by those who adhered to the old faith after the triumph of Islām,—it is now found to be largely saturated with the spirit of those uncongenial idioms, especially the latter of them, with which it was in more immediate contact. Hence, too, it has been designated the speech of "*Pā-Zend*"="the Commentary," and of "*Buzurgān-e-Dīn*"="the Doctors of Religion." But though the literary memorials now extant in it are, probably without exception, religious, others, now lost, are recorded to have been composed in it on secular subjects; such as the *Zafar-Nāmah*="Book of Victory," by Būzūr, the Vazīr of Nūshirvān; the far older *Kār-Nāmah*="Journal," of uncertain authorship; and a work on Morals by Ardshīr, Bābagān. Further, it must be this same Pārsī, or Old Darī which Mohammedan writers term "*Pahlavī*," while stating that in it, under the patronage of Nūshirvān and his successors, were composed the *Bāstān-Nāmah*="Old Hero-book," and also sundry versions as well of Sanskrita collections of apologues as of treatises by Plato and Aristoteles.

Although, in the present abstract of a long paper,* the disputed appellations *Avestā*, *Zend*, *Darī*, have been passed without discussion, yet it is necessary concisely to review the history and circumscribe the import of the name just mentioned, —*Pahlavī*,—because it has been bandied about, in reference to unconnected and alien objects, with such latitude as to have involved the whole field of Medo-Persic philology in a perplexity truly tantalizing.

From the time of Hyde and Anquetil, European writers, with the sanction and concurrence (as would appear) of the Pārsīs themselves, have designated the *Second* Book-language "*Pahlavī*." And, in accordance with the different views which they have taken of the origin and history of that language, they have espoused different derivations of this name.

* In it the latter "*Darī phasis*" of the language, the modern *Parsī*, and various Arian dialects pure and mixed, were also reviewed, but not in a way that readily admits condensation or abridgement.

Some have deduced it from *pahlū*="vigour," or *pahlau*="strong hero," as if it were strictly synonymous with *Hu-zvāresh* (according to the etymology put upon the latter term until lately), and representative of the speech in which the *Pahlawān-e-Jahān*—those Paladins who upheld Irān, while its sway was most extended—embodied their conceptions; others from *Pahlava*, as applied to the Parthian tribes, or from *Pehlev* as indicating the old battle-ground of Rustam and Afrāsiāb; others, from *Pahlū*, as restricted to the Border-land between the purely Persian and the Arabo-Chaldaic territories. But *Pahlavī* is defined by some Moslem authorities as simply ="ancient *Pārsī*;" and by all of them this is employed as the ordinary designation of the tongue which they describe as having been the national one down to the Saracen conquest, or even later. Numerous words noticed by Firdausī as *Pahlavī* are purely Irānian, not of Semitic parentage, as many of them at least must have been, if really *Huzvāresh*; and it has been observed, likewise, that the poet commutes *Pahlavī* and *Pārsī* as epithets distinctive of his own phraseology. The truth then is, that, in Moslem usage, *Pahlavī* suggests the *Third* Book-language—the one above discussed under the titles *Pā-Zend* and *Pārsī*; occasionally comprehending also the *Darī*, in which the third language came to be absorbed; just as the names *Darī* and *Pārsī* likewise have been sometimes treated as interchangeable. Before this state of the case was clearly demonstrated by Joseph Müller, the name *Pahlavī* had been construed, in *all* Oriental works alike, as referring to *one* language, and that the *Huzvāresh*; but the unhappy result had been the perpetuation of such philological and historical hypotheses, incongruous and untenable alike, as have previously passed under our review.

Since, now, the name in question has been ascertained to denote, in one set of writers, the *Second* Book-language—one strongly tinged with Aramaism, but, in another set, the *Third* Book-language—one of more purely Iranian organisation, it may be inquired, whether either of its applications favour any of the three etymologies, which, as was above mentioned, have been proposed for it, or rather a fourth must be resorted to for it in one or other—or both—of those applications. Now, a

retrospect at the conditions of the problem evinces that two of the etyma must be summarily set aside. The third, viz. *Pahlū*="Border-land," is suitable to *Pahlavī* as denoting the hybrid speech of Khūzistān; but, manifestly, it is not at all appropriate in reference to the language of Farsistān and Kōhistāu, of which the Darī employed by Tabarī and Firdausī was the offspring; and hence it becomes desirable to find one which may lie at the root of and explain both applications. Various reasons recommend *pahalam* = *par' uwam* = *parum*, &c., a word which means both "excellent" and "ancient," and which, moreover—what it is especially important to observe—is sometimes contrasted in usage with the later "*Parsī*," and synonymous with "*Zabān-e-Bāstānī*"="the ancient tongue." It will thus appear probable, that the *Pahlavas* and *Pahlawān* are so designated as being "the ancient tribe," and the *Pahlavī* as being "the ancient speech." If so, one may collate the *Pelasgoi* and the *Graioi* or *Græci* in relation to the *Hellēnes*, as also the *Prisci* and the *Casci* in relation to the *Latini*! and this, whether or not "ancient" be likewise the radical sense of—that much-tortured appellative—*Pelasgoi*, as well as of *Casci*, of *Prisci*=*pristini*, and of *Graioi*—an abridgement of *geraioi* which is illustrated by *graia* and *graus*. It were needless to embarrass this analogy by suggesting further, that *Pelasgoi*,—if strengthened from *Pelagoi*, a sister-form of *Pelaioi*,—might not even serve as an etymological link between *Prisci* (coll. *prius*, *primum*, *prin*, *paros*, *perusi*, *palai*, &c.) and *Pahlava* or *Palhava*, through a series of letter-changes, which separately would be easy, although cumulatively they might appear improbable.

Tuesday, September 7.

The Origin, Characteristics, and Dialect of the People in the Counties of Down and Antrim. By the Rev. A. Hume, D.C.L. LL.D. F.S.A.

The district comprising the counties of Down and Antrim of which Belfast is the natural centre, is one which has exercised a most important influence on the destinies of the human race in these islands. In Down, the patron saint made his

first convert, and there his ashes repose; in Antrim the real Ossianic poems are supposed to have existed. In Down was the ancient Ulidia, from which the extended name Ulster is derived; in Antrim was the ancient Dalradia, the name of which was applied to a large portion of modern Scotland. Ireland was originally known as Scotia, or Scotia Major; and when the name was superseded at home, it was retained by our enterprising colonists to Argyle and Lorn, and afterwards extended to all North Britain, after the conquest by Kenneth in the ninth century. The line of kings descended from Fergus the son of Erc not only mingled its blood with the Saxon and Norman royal lines of England, but afterwards inherited the sovereignty of Great Britain; so that Queen Victoria traces an authentic descent from the petty chieftains of this neighbourhood in the fifth century.

More than a thousand years afterwards the debt of colonization was repaid, at the time of the Plantation of Ulster. The Anglo-Saxon population had been so long separated into two branches, the English and Scotch—differing in country, laws, religion, manners, prejudices—that they must be regarded as two peoples, and not one. If to these we add the remnant of the native Irish, there are three distinct elements, from the composition of which, in different quantities and situations, the inhabitants of the two counties are derived.

These localities are the following:—the Irish, in the hilly districts, as in the "Glynnes" [glens] of Antrim; and the Irish-speaking population in the neighbourhood of Cushendall. There are a few in almost every parish, and several in the great towns. In Down, few occur north of Downpatrick and Ballynahinch; they then converge to the mountains of Mourne, by the parish of Loughin-island. In the past generation, Irish was frequently spoken in the markets of Downpatrick, Castlewellan, Dromara, and Ballynahinch; now it is rarely used as a separate mode of communication. In the districts of the Celts they preserve their traditional antipathies, though they assimilate in language; and the terms "Irish," "Scotch," and "English," are used currently by the nearest neighbours in reference to ancestral origin.

The Scottish immigration followed two natural routes—by

the Mull of Cantyre to the County Antrim, near the Causeway; and by the Mull of Galloway to the County Down, by Donaghadee. From the earliest time, coracle, skiff, and coaster must have passed in this way, and the two distinct streams ran right across the counties. In Down, the Scotch current is traceable by Comber, Killileagh, Saintfield, and Annahilt, nearly to Hillsborough; also by Castlereagh and Purdysburn, to near Belfast. In the County Antrim the course is by Ballymoney and Ballymena, up to the town of Antrim, and over the back of Devis and the Cave-hill.

The English settlers occupied mainly the low countries, such as the basins of the Lagan and Bann, and the banks of Lough Neagh. Belfast was originally an English town, but its external increase has been mainly from the two Scottish districts. Lisburn was a small English and Welsh colony: it is now practically an English town. In one barony of Antrim, of 128 townlands the population is all of English origin; and Aghalee, Ballinderry, &c., look like parts of England.

At various points the different races meet, but refuse to mingle. There are English, Irish, and Scotch quarters in several towns, such as Downpatrick and Carrickfergus; and the Lagan, near Lisburn, separates the two races. In one half of the parish of Hillsborough the people are all Scotch, in the other they are all English. A hill near Ballynahinch separates the two races; and the island of Rathlin has its two promontories occupied, one by the Irish, the other by the English and Scotch.

The religion, habits, customs, &c., may all be deduced from this distribution. In religion, for instance, the rule is, that the English are Episcopalians; the Scotch, Presbyterians; and the Irish, Roman Catholics. The lines of Scottish population may be marked on the map by a double chain of Presbyterian meeting-houses, while in the English districts they are rare or unknown. In fourteen Presbyteries of the General Assembly, seven of which are in each county, there are upwards of 200 congregations. If to these we add other Presbyterian congregations not connected with the Assembly we shall find that fully one-half of all the congregations in

Ireland are situated in these two counties, or connected with Presbyteries that centralize in them. More than one-half of these are in rural districts, unconnected with towns or villages, and called by the names of townlands; shewing that the Scotch were in general agriculturists, and less settled in towns than the English. In the English districts the church-and-king feeling is strong; but, from the magnitude of the parishes and the distance of churches from particular points, the people are less attentive than they should be to their religious duties. In the Irish districts the Roman-Catholic congregations are large, and those of the two branches of the Protestant Church are small. In the English and Scotch districts several parishes are united to form one in the Roman-Catholic arrangements; and again, Drumgooland, where Protestants are few in number, is divided into two Roman-Catholic parishes. This is in the neighbourhood of Dolly's Brae, and it is said that in two townlands of Backaderry and Magheramayo, as well as in several others, there are scarcely any Protestant families.

The habits of the people, as well as of their creed, indicate their origin. In the English districts there is more comfort and tidiness than we find elsewhere; for the man of Scottish ancestry does not enjoy life so well, though he may be actually richer. The Scotchman is often more intelligent than his English neighbour, but he rarely excels him in weight of character. In the English districts the farms are large, and there is a better kind of house, furniture, stock, food, clothing, &c. The man of English origin will live and let live. In the markets of Lurgan, Lisburn, Moira, and Portadown, the Down farmer is known from the Antrim one, or rather the Scotchman from the English, by his hardness in driving a bargain. The old English sports and pastimes were kept up till recently at Lambeg; the May-pole is still known in Holywood; and tradition leads us to believe that certain mystery plays have been performed in the district. The custom of hiring servants at stated fairs is followed in Antrim, as is the case in many other towns and places of England; and while those who attend for the purpose at Carlisle carry a straw in the mouth, those at Antrim carry a little white rod in the hand. The settlers on the Marquis of Hertford's estate were in

general natives of the shires adjoining the Bristol Channel; and as their ancestral district is the apple district of England, so the barony of Upper Massareene is the apple district of Ireland. After the lapse of 250 years, the ancient custom is preserved as if it were of yesterday. The superstitions of May-eve and Hallow-e'en are still practised, and not one of the ceremonies in Burns' poem is neglected, even by those to whom the poem is utterly unknown.

The names of persons and of places are also highly illustrative of the people. In the English districts we meet with such names as Turner, Standfield, Hull, Moore, Shields; in the Scottish, Dunbar, Edgar, Livingstone, Kennedy, Douglas, and sometimes they undergo curious transformations. In the Irish districts a few names are used with distinctive terms and epithets, and sometimes Irish names are translated into English or Anglicised; M'Shane becomes Johnston, and Ginnif, Sands, while M'Gurnaghan is altered to the more euphonious Gordon. Names of places are often derived from those of persons, as Hill-town, Hill-hall, and Hills-borough, from the Downshire family; Gill-hall and Gilford from the M'Gills; and similarly Warings-town, Ross-trevor, Echlinville, Mount-stewart. Groom's-port is Graeme's-port, and Ballymcarrett the village of M'Art. Many names are less distinctly known, as Bryan's-ford, Lyle-hill, Randal's-town; others allude to the original possessors, as Acre M'Cricket, Taggart's-land, Douglas-land, Dobbin's-land, Bally-copeland, Bally-french, Bally-gilbert..

Dr. Hume concluded his remarks with a *vivâ voce* description of the Hyberno-English dialect in these two counties, and shewed, by various quotations, its local characteristics, and also its usefulness. From the fusion of many peculiarities and the mingling of provincialisms from various parts of the United Kingdom, it is particularly useful in the illustration of our old English literature.

On the Misapplication of the terms Evolution and Development, as applied by Ethnological Philologists to the Inflexions of a Language. By RICHARD CULL, Fellow and Hon. Sec. of the Ethnological Society.

This paper is more of a critical character than fraught with new facts, as indeed its title conveys. Philologists speak of a language developing its inflexions, or having its inflexions evolved. It appears to the author that Horne Tooke clearly pointed out the nature of the inflexions of languages; that the researches of all philologers have confirmed his view; and yet we continue to speak of evolving inflexions. Many persons attribute a vast mental superiority, at least in language, to certain nations of antiquity, for having developed inflexions in their language; and deem the descendants of those same nations to be inferior, because they have not only not developed any inflexions, but have been unable to maintain those which were developed by their ancestors. If the views of Horne Tooke be sound, the idea of developing, in the sense of opening or unfolding, is erroneous.

A change in the form of a word to express a different meaning is called an inflexion. The form of a word can be changed in two ways—

1. By adding one or more sounds, or even syllables, to it, as *love, loved, loving.*

2. By a change *in* the word, as *speak, spoke:* and both methods of changing the form may occur in the same word, as *speak, spoken.*

The word *loved* differs both in form and sense from the word *love.* The word *spoke* also differs in both respects from the word *speak.* And the word *spoken* differs in both respects from *speak.*

What is expressed in one language by such a change, called an inflexion, may be expressed in another by a different method; thus, the Latin *dominus,* "a lord," besides its other changes of form, has one which gives it a feminine signification, *domina,* "a lady"; but the English word "lord" has no feminine inflexion. Thus, while in Latin a part of the word only is changed, in English another word is adopted. The

word "lady" is not an inflexion of the word "lord." Languages differ greatly in regard to inflexion: some abound in inflexions, while others have but few. They are numerous in Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and the Sclavonic languages, less so in English, and at the lowest in Chinese.

We know how these inflexions were produced. They are not produced by any opening, as a bud opens into a flower, but by the coalescence of another word, or fragment of a word, with the original word.

We can shew in many languages the word whose fragment is coalesced. Now, a junction of two things, even when well incorporated together, cannot with propriety be called a development or evolution.

In the Hebrew language the personal pronouns are termed separable and inseparable. The separable pronouns represent the person to be in the nominative case. The inseparable exhibit only some fragment of the separable pronoun combined with some word.

In the Malay the plural is formed by adding some word or words which signify *much, many*, or the like, or by repeating the same word, as *oran baniak* or *oran oran*, "many man," or "man-man."

In the Coptic the syllable *ni* or *na*, which is prefixed to form the plural, is, no doubt, says Professor Lee, the word *na* or *naa*, which means "much, many, or great." In Lee's Hebrew Grammar the subject of the coalescence of words with fragments of other words is treated in a masterly manner.

If we study human speech for ourselves, by closely observing what is going on, instead of merely reading books on the subject of grammar, we shall detect the process by which inflexions are formed. The formation of inflexions, like other changes in language, are not the result of a committee of learned men sitting in solemn council. There is no deliberation whatever in the matter. Learned men and grammarians do not make the changes. They only observe and record the changes that are taking place in the language of the mass of the people; and all these changes are made in the spoken language.

The two objects of language are—

1. To convey ideas, &c.
2. To do so rapidly.

In our common speech we are ever striving to convey our thoughts with rapidity, and in our efforts to do so we involuntarily abbreviate many words, and join those abbreviations or verbal fragments to other words. In this way we economise sounds, syllables, and sometimes words. The word *them* is commonly imperfectly uttered in the rapidity of familiar discourse. It is abbreviated by cutting off the *theta* in such phrases as, *I gave 'em* instead of *I gave them.* This was observed above a century ago, when an attempt was made to render the written language a transcript of the spoken by printing the abbreviation *'em* for *them.* The first edition of Lord Shaftesbury's Characteristics was so printed.

Again, in familiar talk we say *I aint* for *I am not*; *I wont* for *I will not*: *I shant* for *I shall not.* These examples, so far from being exhaustive, are merely instances from groups of such abbreviations. The act of subordinating an auxiliary verb to the principal verb of a sentence seems to crush the auxiliary into a mere fragment, as in the sentence *I have done,* which is in rapid talk broken down into *I'v done.* Such cases illustrate the formation of an inflexion, and is what is passing under our daily observation. A number of reasons prevent the transfer of these colloquialisms from being transferred to writing, but no one who has studied the subject will doubt, that if our language were an unwritten one, and now about to become a written one, such forms of inflexion would be noted and written as a part of the language.

The author has observed similar phenomena in several European languages. Hence the causes that produce such phenomena in our own language are also operating with similar results in certain other living languages, and it is to such causes alone that we can refer the formation of inflexions in the Hebrew and other ancient languages. The formation of inflexions, then, is not by developing something out of a word, but by adding something to that word.

Remarks on an Ethnological Collection, in illustration of the Ethnology of Java. By Dr. Biallobłotzki.

Notes on Blumenbach's Classification of the Human Race. By Richard Cull, Fellow and Hon. Sec. of the Ethnological Society.

The following delegates represented the Ethnological Society.

Joseph Moore, M.D.
F. Hindmarsh, F.G.S., and
Richard Cull, *Hon. Sec.*